

B) REMARKS:**1. Introduction**

Claims 1-15 and are currently pending in this application. Claims 1 and 8 are independent. Certain amendments to claims 1-3, 6-8 and 12-13 have been entered herein in response to the Examiner's rejections, as detailed hereinafter. Other amendments to the claims have also been made to clarify the scope of that which the Applicants regard as their invention, and are not meant to unduly restrict the scope of those recitations that existed prior to such amendments or limit the applicability of any equivalents thereto.

No new subject matter has been added to this application by these amendments.

2. Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and 103(a)

In paragraphs 1-7 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected various of the pending claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,798,118 to Rao et al. (hereinafter 'Rao') or under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious in view of Rao and the Examiner's Official Notice asserted in paragraph 5.

This rejection has been overcome by the following amendments entered in various forms to the Applicant's independent claims 1 and 8 herein:

(a) "providing the plurality of intermediate servers to route local and non-local data packets within the high-speed access network infrastructure using only destination-based packet forwarding;"

(b) "providing the at least one managed access point server to receive only non-local packets from the plurality of intermediate servers and to route the non-local data packets to the plurality of service networks using only source address-based policy routing;"

(c) "assigning a network address to a customer of the high-speed access network infrastructure, the network address based on a subscription of the customer to a service network, wherein the address is assigned from a list of network addresses that are dynamically allocated only to customers of the high-speed access network infrastructure that are subscribers of the service network;"

- (d) "receiving a local data packet from the customer at one of the plurality of intermediate servers;"
- (e) "forwarding the local data packet within the high-speed access network infrastructure using only destination-based packet forwarding;"
- (f) "receiving a non-local data packet from the customer at one of the plurality of intermediate servers;"
- (g) "forwarding the non-local data packet to a managed access point router using only destination-based packet forwarding;"
- (h) "receiving the non-local data packet at the managed access point router;"
- (i) "comparing a source address of the non-local data packet to the list of network addresses;" and
- (j) "forwarding the packet to a router in the service network only when the source address matches a network address from the list."

Support for these recitations can be found, inter alia, in the Applicant's Specification at:

(a)-(h) lines 47-51; lines 168-175; lines 244-269

(i)-(j) lines 180-199; lines 279-290

The Applicants have been mindful of the provisions of MPEP §608.01(o) in making these amendments.

Rao does not teach or suggest the combination of recitations (a)-(j) above. Rao instead is primarily concerned with routing telephone call packets, not local and non-local data packets. Intermediate servers of Rao use many routing policies and not just destination-based routing as recited herein. The centralization of source address-based routing policies only in the managed access point servers as now recited allows the inventive network claimed herein to avoid use of interconnection points to each service network at every regional access network site (see lines 55-56 of the Applicants' Specification), and avoids potential routing loops in the network (see, lines 225-230).

For these reasons, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1 and 8 are respectfully requested. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of remaining dependent


claims 2-7 and 9-15 are likewise respectfully requested based on their ultimate dependency on the independent claims.

3. Conclusion

This amendment is responsive to each issue raised in the Office Action dated June 3, 2005. All objections and rejections of pending claims 1-15 have been overcome above. The Applicant therefore respectfully requests allowance of each of the pending claims as amended herein, and issuance of the present application.

In the event that a further extension of time is required in addition to that requested previously herein, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time, or credit any overpayment, to the below-signed practitioner's deposit account number: 502396.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
Charles A. Rattner
Registration No. 40,136
12 Homewood Lane
Darien, CT 06820-6109
(203) 662-9858
(203) 547-6129 (facsimile)
crattner@axiomlegal.net

Dated: December 5, 2005